

THE BOSTON MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL.

VOL. XXIV.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 1841.

No. 19.

REVIEW OF PROF. SMITH'S SELECT DISCOURSES.*—NO. I.

To the Editor of the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal.

SIR,—The work of Dr. Smith, the title of which we have here given, has been strangely neglected by the medical press, there not having appeared any notice of it, either favorable or the reverse, so far as we are aware, although it has now been nearly a year before the public. It is certainly due to the author's station, being a professor of physiology in one of our principal medical schools, that the work should receive some attention, and not be allowed, in one sense at least, to fall *stillborn* from the press. We know not what success the work has met with, or whether it has met with any at all; the probability however, we think, is, that like most other of our indigenous productions, it has been neglected, while some showy exotic, of perhaps less vigorous shoot, has been permitted to thrust it aside.

The work of Dr. Smith consists of five lectures, which we are told form a part of his course in the College of Physicians and Surgeons of New York, but which were delivered to popular audiences, for the benefit of a very worthy institution, the New York Lyceum of Natural History. As these lectures have now become public property, we deem it an act of justice to the author, as well as due to the interests of science, to examine their merits, to see whether they are in advance of what is already known on the subjects of which they treat, and whether their publication is likely to subserve the interests of morality and sound learning.

The first lecture is on the "Diversities of the Human Character, arising from physiological peculiarities." As the author, though no phrenologist, believes in the doctrine that "our virtues and our vices are in a great measure constitutional," he endeavors to find, in our physical organization, a satisfactory cause for this phenomenon; and why it is, that persons born and brought up under the same circumstances, should yet differ so widely in their dispositions and characters. The organs which chiefly influence our characters, Dr. S. states to be the brain, the lungs, the liver, and the sexual organs. "It being a well-established principle," says he, "in the animal economy, that the effect which any organ produces in the body, is in the compound ratio of its relative bulk, and the quantity of *aeriated* blood which it may receive, I shall first point out the condition of the

* Select Discourses on the Functions of the Nervous System, in opposition to Phrenology, Materialism and Atheism, to which is prefixed a Lecture on the Diversities of the Human Character, arising from physiological peculiarities. By John Augustine Smith, M.D., Prof. of Physiology in the University of New York. 8vo., pp. 210.

several important parts above mentioned, with regard to these two particulars, and show how changes in them, with respect to these circumstances, do actually produce the moral revolutions before mentioned. I shall then prove that it is upon the completeness of these changes, or, in other words, upon the influence which the one or other of these parts may ultimately acquire and maintain in the system, that the character of the individual greatly depends." Dr. S. evidently intends to convey the impression that this theory originated with himself, whereas it is the one taught, with some modifications, by Richerand, and many other physiologists of modern times. The former says, "the predominance of any particular system of organs, modifies the whole economy, impresses striking differences on the organization, and has no less influence on the moral and intellectual, than on the physical faculties."—(*Phys. p. 486.*) They are substantially the same doctrines which Dr. Thomas maintains in his work, "*Physiologie des Temperamens ou Constitutions*," &c., published at Paris in 1826, and also most ably elucidated by Dr. Caldwell, of Kentucky, in his Essay on Temperament, published in 1831. The latter remarks, "The difference between individuals, or rather classes of the human family, which temperament is made to designate, appears to depend on two causes: diversity of organization in parts or the whole of the bodies of different persons, giving rise to a corresponding diversity in the vital properties; and *difference of size and vigor in certain ruling organs of the system.*" "The organs alluded to are those contained in the three great cavities of the body; the chylopoietic, situated in the abdomen, and including the stomach and intestines, with the liver, pancreas, mesentery and lacteals; those of sanguification and circulation, situated in the thorax, and consisting of the lungs, heart and bloodvessels; and the brain with its appendages, the spinal cord and nerves. These three groups are not only the ruling organs in the person of man; connected with the head and soft parts that enclose them, *they constitute the person.*" "To these organs must we look as the main source of human character," &c. The author's theory, then, as to the "diversities of character from physiological peculiarities," is not original with him, although, in illustrating his views, there is no lack of original suggestions. Dr. S. believes that there is a great uniformity in the character of children, and that this is owing to their having a larger brain in proportion to their bodies than adults, it being, in his opinion, three or four times the relative size in the former. In our judgment it would be more philosophical to prove this uniformity of character, before attempting its explanation; at any rate, we do not believe in any such uniformity. "When children are puny and delicate," says Dr. S., "they frequently exhibit marks of premature intelligence, particularly as regards observation and reflection, and people remark, 'what a pity it is so sensible a child should be so sickly.' But we now see that it is to this very feebleness of body that many children are indebted for their superiority. For the circulation in the brain being thereby rendered feeble, that viscus, as in the adult, is more upon a par with the rest of the system. Should the health of such children be restored with their returning vigor, the brain resumes its wonted superiority, and quickly destroys their pretensions to unusual in-

telligence." This is certainly most extraordinary reasoning! Precocity of intellect owing to a smaller quantity of blood being sent to the brain, and prevented by an increased flow to that organ! The effect is taken for the cause, for "the feebleness of body" is owing to the fact that the other organs of the body are deprived of their usual quantity of blood, from the excess sent to the brain, and in adults, Dr. S. himself admits, that in highly intellectual individuals, the brain has an unusually large supply of blood. The facts in the case are, that in childhood, the brain is very soft, and supplied with more blood, in proportion to its size, than at any subsequent period. It also grows more rapidly than any other organ, so that its weight, at the end of the first six months, is nearly doubled; consequently the nervous system is the earliest developed, and becomes the predominating system in youth. It is this rapid development, which increases the liability of the brain to disease, especially to convulsions, inflammation and dropsy. Now, if, in this state of things, the stimulus of mental exercise be added, *which always increases the flow of blood to the head*, who can doubt that the liability to nervous disease will be increased, and that other parts of the body will languish, from want of their usual supply of nervous energy, and sanguineous fluid? Mental precocity is indeed a symptom of disease, but not of such disease as Dr. S. would have us believe; there is a morbid determination of blood to the head, and either the whole brain, or some portion of it, will be found much enlarged. This enlargement of the brain may, indeed, be primary, as is probably the case in rickets, and the increased mental power is the consequence of this augmentation. But both are caused by a preternatural supply of blood to the brain. We know not how it may be with others, but we have never noticed that "puny and sickly children" are always mentally superior to others; or that while in that state, they manifest such an increase of mental capacity, over what they exhibited in a healthy state. The brain, according to Dr. S., acquires its complete size at *seven years of age*, when the cerebral influence begins to diminish, and the "blood is determined to other organs." But sometimes this influence is permanent, and then, men are only "children of a larger growth;" "they are restless, captious, irascible and violent, ready to engage in any pursuit, and always eager, but easily diverted from one object to another. Of gratitude they are incapable, and of friendship they know only the name. They are so credulous as to be duped by every designing knave, and are not remarkable for courage, either active or passive. Such are the effects of great permanent excitement in the brain," &c.

These, according to our author, are the moral and intellectual characteristics of a preternatural flow of blood to the brain; and that such effects do flow from such a cause, he thinks completely and absolutely proved by the influence of alcohol, which always "accelerates the cerebral circulation." This is a very unfortunate illustration for our author's purpose, for alcohol by no means invariably produces such results. "A drunken man," says Macnish, "is amorous, or musical, or quarrelsome, according to his temperament." Accordingly, this writer makes several varieties of drunkards, as 1. The "*sanguineous drunkard*," in whom the criminal propensities prevail over the moral and intellectual ones;

who is prone to combativeness and sensuality, and is either very good-natured or extremely quarrelsome," &c. 2. *The melancholic drunkard.* 3. *The surly drunkard.* 4. *The phlegmatic drunkard.* 5. *The nervous drunkard.* 6. *The choleric drunkard,* &c. The fact will then be found to be, that determination of blood to the head will bring out and render manifest the predominant mental traits in the individual, according to the old adage "in vino veritas;" but it will not melt all characters into one, and make all "restless, captious, irascible and violent." Those "in whom the action of the lungs is unmodified by the influence of the brain, are extremely apt," says Dr. S., "to fall into mental derangement. To this, indeed, *the excessive action in their lungs always predisposes them*; and should this action be, from any cause, much augmented, fatuity at least is the inevitable consequence." We hardly understand what Dr. S. means by the action of the lungs being unmodified by that of the brain; but so far as we do understand it, we are disposed to deny that there is any such temperament, as we certainly deny that excessive action of the lungs predisposes to consumption. The fallacious hope of recovery, indulged by consumptive patients, proves nothing, because in many of these cases there is a diminished quantity of blood sent to the lungs, in all of them there is a "diminished energy in the lungs," and it was probably owing to this very feebleness, in original constitution, that they became the seat of disease. There is no evidence whatever, that there has ever been any "increased action" in the lungs, especially in purely tubercular cases of disease; and if there were, what connection can be traced between this condition and that of "fatuity" or "insanity"? Another proof of the influence of the increased action of the lungs, Dr. S. thinks may be derived from the effect of changes of the weather. "Every person," says he, "must have felt, in close, foggy weather, when the air is almost unfit for respiration, how heavy and listless he is; but let a change take place, let his lungs be stimulated by a clear, elastic air, his imagination immediately brightens up, and all his faculties seem renovated."

This reasoning seems to us singularly illogical and inconclusive. In the first place, there is no proof whatever of increased action in the lungs in clear weather, although it is difficult to understand what Dr. Smith means by the term. If he means that the number of respirations in a minute are increased, we deny it; if he maintains that an increased quantity of blood is thrown into the lungs in clear weather, we doubt it still as much. The uncomfortable feeling which we experience in close, foggy weather, is doubtless owing to the hygrometric condition of the atmosphere, and especially the high state of the dew-point, which prevents the usual degree of transpiration by the surface. When we consider that almost one half of all the ingesta are thus removed from the system, and that in an atmosphere saturated with moisture, with the dew-point at a temperature nearly that of the human body, transpiration must, as a matter of course, almost wholly cease, we cannot wonder that there should be a "heavy and listless" feeling, or that a change to a clear, dry atmosphere should be attended with a corresponding relief.

Another proof, by which the author attempts to sustain his opinions, is

drawn from the brilliancy of the countenance of children, in the first or forming stage of croup. But this seems to us as inconclusive as the former. There is no proof whatever of increased "action in the lungs," or of an increased flow of blood to these organs, the afflux being to the larynx and upper portion of the trachea.

"The action of the sexual system," says Dr. S., "seems to depend very much upon that of the pulmonary organs." We have as little doubt of this, as we have that the action of every part depends much upon the same organs. So far as the healthy function of every part depends on a due supply of oxygenated blood, in that degree is it dependent for its healthy condition on the pulmonary system. We have no proof that consumptive women are more apt to conceive than other women, though it is a fact that serious disease of the lungs does not prevent conception. This is the most that can be said, and this goes but a little way in sustaining the author's opinions.

"The timidity, despondency, and distrust of old age," Dr. S. thinks are entirely owing to venous plethora, and particularly increased "influence of the liver"! All gloomy and depressing passions, he attributes to "affections of the liver and spleen." When the influence of the liver is "considerable," but not very great, and there is combined with it "adequate vigor in the cerebral circulation," with a "countenance neither sallow nor ruddy, but a compound of both," &c. the individual is then "cold, cautious and calculating, of correct moral habits, his passions are under control, except anger," which renders him very "violent when roused." He has no "quickness of intellect," but a "strong memory." He has great perseverance, is "suspicious," has no attachments, and neither "has friends, nor believes in friendship." He is governed entirely by "self-interest," not only in private affairs, but in all the great questions of politics and morals. All this is due to a liver of moderate size and activity, with an adequate cerebral circulation. We leave it to the reader whether this be not purely a fancy sketch; whether there does exist in nature, such a connection between character, and the condition of these two organs, as is here pointed out. We doubt both premises and conclusion, and we appeal to every observer of human character to bear us out in this opinion. Such an organization as Dr. S. here describes, is of extremely frequent occurrence; perhaps it embraces a majority of the human family; but yet, for the honor of human nature, we should hope that there are but few such characters in the world as he here describes.

If the liver has but the "same degree of influence while the brain is deprived of its power, the skin of its blood, and the muscles of their plumpness," then we have "the most contemptible being that inhabits this earth. He is poor, weak, mean and malicious; devoid of every noble sentiment, of every generous feeling." He is jealous and malicious, constantly attacking those whom he suspects to be his enemies, "but he has neither skill to direct, nor strength to give it force, and but for the gall, with which it is tipped, it would fall harmless to the ground." Such is the all-powerful influence of the liver—in Dr. Smith's opinion—which we shall leave him to enjoy, without attempting to expose its absurdity,

which is too self-evident to need a single remark. When the "action is intense in both the brain and the liver," we have men of "strong minds and gloomy imaginations, incapable of enjoying present good, for fear of approaching evil." Such men are much in danger of insanity. When the "strong action in the liver is unmodified by that of the brain," the individual is an "ordinary hypochondriac." When the nervous system is unduly excitable, we have a "sensitive," but "feeble mind;" and when the muscles are large, a "dull" intellect. When "every part performs its appropriate office in healthful exactitude," then we have the "tempered temperament" of the ancients, a very happy condition of things. In conclusion, Dr. S. remarks, "In training the mind to religion and virtue, no pains should be spared, because much may be accomplished. But if our efforts fail, and sometimes fail they will, however well directed, we may console ourselves with the reflection, that moral causes cannot always either supply deficiencies, or control aberrations, resulting from the physiological peculiarities of our corporeal functions."

Thus we have endeavored to give a brief summary of the doctrines presented us by Dr. S. in the lecture under review. We have done so for two reasons. In the first place, to show that those who reject phrenology and still attempt to account for mental peculiarities, are obliged to attribute them to the *predominance of certain physical organs*, and so are as prone to the charge of materialism as those whom they are constantly denouncing as materialists. In the next place, to demonstrate the absurdities of that system, which attempts to resolve mental differences into the "increased action" of those bodily organs, whose functions are known to be purely physical, or at any rate not to control mental peculiarities. The attempt can be viewed in no other light than a signal failure—an effort to erect a system upon a narrow and tottering foundation. Dr. S. points out the chief characteristics of the *sanguineous*, the *bilious*, the *melancholic*, the *lymphatic*, and the *nervous* temperaments, without designating them by name, and thus the unlearned reader is led to suppose there is great originality in the author's views. These temperaments, it is well known, run into each other, and become changed and modified by various causes; they also indicate the constitutional qualities of the brain, and are therefore of great importance in determining the mental peculiarities of the individual. But nothing is gained by speaking of "intense action in the brain," "strong action in the liver," "action of the lungs unmodified by the influence of the brain," &c. If anything has been established in physiology, it is that the *brain alone is the organ of the mind*, though the mind is influenced by derangements of other organs, through sympathy; but to make "diversities of character" dependent on these organs, rejecting altogether the cerebral influence, is to go in the face of well-known facts, and implies a belief that the mind is actually seated in some of these thoracic and abdominal viscera. We shall recur to this subject again, in our next number, when we propose to consider Dr. Smith's objections to phrenology.

CANDIDUS.

DR. FLINT'S REPORT OF CASES OF TYPHUS FEVER AT THE ERIE COUNTY ALMS-HOUSE.

[Concluded from page 287.]

CASE III. Convalescence on the 17th day.—Mrs. Stewart, aged about 35. Subject to epilepsy, which has resulted in a loss of the intellectual faculties, approaching to idiocy. General health previously good. First made complaint on the 17th of February. Was not well, however, on the 16th. Calomel and rhei, $\bar{a}\bar{a}$ gr. x. was administered on the 17th by prescription of the resident pupil, which was followed by one dejection in the 24 hours following.

18th, A. M.—Tongue coated; pulse accelerated; complained of general pain, also of nausea. Some tenderness over abdomen. Directed emp. vesicat. 6 by 6 to abdomen, and p. Dov. gr. v. at bed-time.

19th, A. M.—Symptoms same. Owing to her removal of the blister, no vesication was produced. Directed it to be re-applied. P. rhei, gr. xv. mané, and p. Dov. gr. vj. vesperé.

20th, A. M.—Tongue loaded with yellowish white coat, moist; pulse slightly accelerated, and moderately full. Says she has pains "all over" in head, loins and limbs. Pressure of abdomen produces some pain. Had three dejections yesterday. Vesication imperfect, owing to her persisting in removing the blister. Mind wandering; thirst not urgent; anorexia; urine small in quantity; one dejection last night. *Rose spots very distinct, vivid and numerous over chest and arms, even to wrists.* Abdomen soft. Directed acetous preparation of colchicum three times, omitting it if it should nauseate or purge.

21st, A. M.—No improvement nor essential alteration of symptoms. Constant delirium, occasionally active, getting out of bed, and once escaping from the ward. Answers no questions, nor protrudes her tongue on being desired; abdomen tender over region of cæcum; no dejections since yesterday. Medicine has been imperfectly administered, owing to her ejecting it from her mouth after receiving it. Rose spots appeared on breast, arms, and back of hands. Pulse moderately accelerated, rather full; skin natural temperature and feeling. Cont. med.

22d, A. M.—Appearance improved; active delirium through night; tendency to stupor to-day, but looking around, and replies to questions. Said she felt better. Rose spots cover the whole body. Three dejections yesterday, and three during night. Tongue coated and moist, of brownish white color at sides, and quite dark in centre; pulse the same. P. Dov. gr. v. mané et vesperé.

23d, A. M.—Symptoms same; rather more tendency to stupor; protrudes her tongue with difficulty. **P. M.**—Moderate exacerbation of fever. Rose spots still apparent and vivid. Continue p. Dov.

24th, A. M.—Pulse less accelerated. Rose spots have disappeared; constant muttering delirium; neglects to give notice when she wishes to pass her evacuations; one dejection during 23d and 24th, passed in bed. Continue med.

25th, A. M.—Lies in a state of stupor, but is aroused on speaking, and partially protrudes her tongue, the surface of which is dry and hard. No dejections. Give vinegar of colchicum.

26th, *A. M.*—Symptoms same; rose eruption not distinct, but perceptible on chest and arms; two dejections during night. *P. Dov.*

P. M.—Lies apparently sleeping tranquilly; skin mellow; pulse moderately accelerated. Resident pupil reports that the skin was perspirable this forenoon.

27th, 12th day of disease, *A. M.*—Stupor; skin cool and supple; tongue covered with moist, slimy coat; protrudes it, but does not reply to interrogatories. Continue med.

N. B.—The diet has been gruel, with addition of a little milk.

28th, 13th day, *A. M.*—Tranquil and rational. Asks what she "shall do," she is "so sick," but indicates no pain or particular distress. Tongue loaded with brownish coat, moist. Give aromatic spirits of ammonia, grs. xl., every four hours.

P. M.—Stupid; protrudes her tongue, but does not withdraw it until requested repeatedly.

March 1st, 14th day, *A. M.*—No apparent alteration; tongue is covered with a dry crust; one dejection this morning. Omit ammonia. Give calomel, gr. ii.; *p. ipecac.*, gr. ii. *quaque hora sen.*

2d, 15th day, *A. M.*—Appearance somewhat improved; tongue moist, and cleaning at sides. Resident pupil reports that last evening the respiration was laborious, and the features contracted, so that he anticipated dissolution. Delirious as usual through the night.

N. B.—There has never been, in this case, during my visits, any pulling up of the bed-clothes or subsultus. The general character of the delirium has also been not so much incoherent talking, as a constant moaning, when not in a state of stupor. Cough has been sometimes observed, but it has not been a prominent symptom.

4th, 17th day, *A. M.*—Decidedly better; tongue moist, and thickness of coat diminished; pulse slightly accelerated; still complains of distress "all over." She had three epileptic paroxysms yesterday; skin has been perspirable, and has asked for food. Omit medicine.

5th, 18th day.—Distinctly convalescent. From this date she slowly convalesced. She is now, March 23d, about the house as usual.

CASE IV.—*Convalescence on the 16th day.*—*M. Taber*, keeper of the Alms-house. Previously in good health, with exception of slight cough and expectoration of two or three years' standing, supposed to be bronchitis of a mild grade. Complained, March 24th, of pain in head, loins and extremities; costiveness; tongue somewhat coated, and pulse moderately accelerated. For two or three days has felt general malaise. Took vinegar of colchicum until moderate purging was induced.

23d, *A. M.*—Restless during night; now lassitude, pains in head, &c. continue, but less severe; occasionally some chilliness; inclined to doze; tongue moist, with yellowish coat; anorexia; thirst urgent; pulse considerably accelerated, and rather full. Last night endeavored to excite perspiration by warm pediluvium, and hot drinks, but without success. *P. Dov.*, gr. v., bed-time.

24th, *P. M.*—Pulse considerably accelerated and rather full; face somewhat flushed; temperature of skin elevated. Complains of severe pain in frontal region of head, and within the orbits; less pain in loins

and extremities. Emp. vesicat. 6 by 2 to nuchæ. Placebo of nit. potash every two hours.

25th, A. M.—Reports same. Symptoms not altered. Emet. p. ipecac., grs. xx.; t. ant., gr. ii. A. M. Sol. morphia and spirit. ether nitrosus, nocté.

26th, 5th day, A. M.—Pain (frontal) less severe; extends now occasionally over the face; restless during night; obtained some sleep, disturbed with dreams. *Rose eruption on arms and hands, slightly over the chest, not vivid.* Friction causes their appearance in great numbers. Pulse moderately accelerated, not hard nor full; tongue coated and moist; two dej. after emesis. Apply two blisters on each side of the forehead, of the size of a half dollar, and give morphia, gr. 1-8, with spirit. ether nitrosus, 3 j. every four hours.

P. M.—*Rose spots apparent over the whole body*; some confusion of intellect; no abdominal tenderness.

27th.—Reports better. Pain in head much diminished; considerable confusion of intellect through the night, and some this A. M.; skin cool and supple; tongue thickly coated, white and moist; rose spots over whole body, somewhat livid; no dejections; lies in a dozing state. Ol. ricini, 3 j.

N. B.—Diet has been weak porridge, rice water, &c. He has also been allowed cold water and lemonade freely; and cider, diluted, in small quantities. Sol. morphia and ether nitrosus, nocté.

28th, A. M.—Symptoms same, with exception of confusion of intellect greater; eruption obscure; cough is increased. Emp. vesicat. 6 by 6 to chest.

P. M.—Moderate exacerbation; lies in a dozing state; talks incoherently; does not recover the full possession of his faculties when roused; complains of pain over eyes. R. Calomel, gr. ii.; ipecac., gr. i. quaque hora quatuor.

March 1st.—Mind rather more clear; no dejections; blisters vesicated imperfectly; to be re-inforced and re-applied; no eruption apparent.

P. M.—Cerebral symptoms decidedly better than on yesterday; cough is a troublesome symptom; constant desire to cough, with copious expectoration of mucous sputa; no pain in chest; pulse enumerated 115.

2d, A. M.—More somnolent, not recovering his faculties when roused; frequent pulling up of the bed-clothes, and subsultus; tongue covered with dry, dark coat in centre, moist at sides; skin cool and supple; pulse as yesterday; vesication still imperfect; re-applied with new cerate. Ol. ricini, 3 j. this A. M.; calomel and ipecac. continued.

3d.—No improvement; somnolent; copious expectoration of mucopurulent matter; large quantities are discharged at once; sometimes distinctly bloody and at other times rusty; frequent rattling respiration; blisters have vesicated fully; one dejection, tolerably consistent, of a dark color and very offensive.

4th, 11th day, A. M.—Mind somewhat more clear; tongue dry; pulse 115. *He sweat profusely two hours last evening*; cough and expectoration somewhat diminished; one dej. Calomel and ipecac. are

continued, with the addition of a small quantity of Dover's powder. Emp. vesicat. 7 by 4 over chest.

P. M.—Somnolency, and frequent movements of hands and fingers; tongue dry, encrusted, and almost black.

5th.—No essential alteration. Calomel omitted.

6th.—Mind more clear, as usually for a short period in the morning, during which he has constantly persisted in getting out of bed, and sitting up for a few moments. Usually calls at this time for a roasted apple, which is given. Says, when roused at my visits, that he feels pretty comfortable; mind wanders from any subject before he completes a sentence; cough and expectoration much diminished.

7th, 14th day of disease.—Appearance much better; mind more clear; tongue dry at tip, moist at root and sides; one dejection last evening. To-day the following: R. Calomel, gr. ij.; p. Dov., gr. ij.; p. ipecac., gr. ij.; ros. camphor, gr. ij. quaque hora sen.

8th.—Symptoms improved.

9th.—Pulse natural; tongue moist and coated in dots; mind clear. Calomel omitted.

10th.—Symptoms continue favorable. Moderate pyalism exists; no appetite. Convalescence is dated from the 9th of March, or the 16th day of the disease. He has, up to the present date, March 24th, been slowly recovering his appetite and strength. His cough and expectoration are now as they were previous to his attack.

This patient was visited in consultation by Drs. Trowbridge and Sprague of this city, and Dr. Hoyt of Aurora.

General Remarks.—The preceding cases present a form of disease which in this locality is very rare. They are the only instances which have fallen under my observation since my residence here (nearly five years). I have called it *typhus fever*. It was recorded *typhoid fever* until after the autopsy of the patient who died. Failing to discover the anatomical characteristic of Louis, I was induced to doubt the diagnosis; and on referring to the history of the two diseases as presented by the editors of Marshall Hall's Practice of Medicine, the error was clearly manifest.

It seems most rational to attribute the origin of the disease, in this instance, to animal exhalations. The Alms-house wards are constantly crowded; ventilations are not attended to, unless very particular care is taken by the keeper and his assistants; and previous to the occurrence of the disease they had been much neglected. All these circumstances, however, have existed for the last three years, during which period I have been physician to the House, and no case of the kind has before occurred. During the present season, however, an alteration was made, which, perhaps, had an important influence. The wards heretofore have been heated by means of fireplaces; but during the past winter close stoves were substituted. At the time these cases happened, several of the inmates made complaint of all the symptoms attending the access of the fever. Particular care was taken, as soon as the character of the disease was ascertained, to ventilate all the wards effectually morning and evening; and a solution of chloride of lime, in open vessels, was placed in every room.

The patients affected were all occupants of different wards. Cases *No. I* and *No. II* occurred in opposite portions of the house, nor was there any communication between these two patients. Case *No. III* was in a ward contiguous to that of Case *No. II*; and there may have been sufficient communication in this instance for the operation of contagion. None of the fellow-occupants of the patients sick with the fever, however, have been affected. No changes were made after the disease was determined. Owing to the limited amount of room, this would have been impracticable.

The keeper of the house had confined himself almost entirely within doors previously to his attack, but had avoided the wards occupied by the fever patients. He manifested considerable apprehension of contracting the disease by contagion.

Of the symptoms of the disease, it is to be remarked, that with the exception of the two first cases, there were slight indications only of any affection of the abdominal viscera. The first alone presented diarrhœa. In no case was there meteorism; and in Case *IV*, no tenderness whatever of abdomen. In connection with this last fact, it is to be observed, that the pulmonary symptoms were in this case especially predominant. In neither of the other cases were cough and expectoration prominent symptoms.

With regard to the treatment, it will be perceived that there was not any active method pursued, nor much uniformity. In Case *No. I*, after the access, the treatment was scarcely more than nominal. In this case convalescence was earlier than in the others, but the disease was manifestly less severe. I resolved, in all the cases after the disease was established, to pursue the expectant system. Case *No. IV* was submitted, after the symptoms became severe, to senior consultants, whose suggestions, however, I should state, were cheerfully adopted. In neither of the cases which have recovered, were tonics prescribed during convalescence.

Notwithstanding the dense accumulation of paupers in the Alms-house, this is the first time any epidemic has manifested itself for the past three years, with the exception of a few cases of erysipelas in the spring of 1840, in all of which recovery took place.

Buffalo, N. Y., March 24th, 1841.

NEW HAMPSHIRE MEDICAL SOCIETY.

[Communicated for the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal.]

THE fiftieth anniversary of this venerable Association was holden at the Phoenix Hotel, in Concord, on Tuesday and Wednesday, the first and second days of June. The following officers were elected for the current year.

Luke Howe, Jaffrey, *President*; Dixi Crosby, Hanover, *Vice President*; James B. Abbott, Boscawen, *Secretary*; Eliphalet K. Webster, Hill, *Treasurer*.

Counsellors.—Josiah Crosby, Meredith; Ezra Carter, Concord; John

P. Elkins, N. Durham; Joseph H. Smith, Dover; Micah Eldredge, Nashua; Israel Burnham, Antrim; Josiah Bartlett, Stratham; Josiah C. Eastman, Hampstead; James Batcheller, Marlborough; Isaac Colby, Keene.

Censors.—Timothy Haynes, Concord; Jeremiah F. Hall, Wolfboro'; John Morrison, Alton; Stephen Drew, Milton; William Brown, Chester; Joseph Dalton, Brentwood; Francis P. Fitch, Amherst; Richard Williams, Milford; Isaac Colby, Keene; James Batcheller, Marlboro'.

Delegates to the Examinations at Hanover.—Hanover Dickey, Epsom; Nahum Wight, Gilmanton.

Orators for 1842.—Micah Eldredge, Nashua; Charles A. Savary, Hopkinton.

Committee of Correspondence.—Charles P. Gage, Concord; Francis P. Fitch, Amherst; James Batcheller, Marlboro'; John P. Elkins, N. Durham; Josiah Bartlett, Stratham; Dixi Crosby, Hanover.

The following gentlemen were initiated Fellows of the Society: Israel Burnham, Antrim; Andrew McFarland, Sandwich; James H. Crombie, Francetown; John L. Sweatt, Newport; Joseph Eastman, Candia; and Josiah G. Graves, Nashua.

Two well written and highly interesting dissertations were read by Drs. L. Howe, of Jaffrey, and J. Crosby, of Meredith; the former upon chronic bronchitis, or "minister's ail;" the latter upon the mutual influence of mind and body,

A new district society was chartered, denominated the *Manchester District*, located at Manchester, and embracing the towns in the vicinity.

A large number of patients applied for advice, who were examined and prescribed for, by a committee appointed for the purpose.

From the report of the Delegates to the Medical Institution at Hanover, it appears that it is in a flourishing condition. The following is an extract from their report: "The facilities for acquiring a thorough knowledge of the different branches of the profession are great. The chemical and surgical apparatus is complete, and the museum has been enriched, within the past year, by the addition of more than one hundred rare specimens of pathological anatomy. The Institution, under its present organization, deserves the confidence and patronage of the medical profession, and the public; and the large number of students who attended the lectures during the last course, larger, in fact, than at any similar institution in New England, evinces the fact that its advantages are duly appreciated."

The present year completes half a century since the first organization of the N. H. Medical Society; and perhaps during that time its prospects were never more encouraging than at the present. Numbers of intelligent and enterprising physicians are annually flocking to its standard from all directions; and the meetings of the district societies are becoming more and more interesting.

The Society, after transacting the usual amount of business, hearing dissertations, &c., and enjoying the mutual interchange of good feelings, adjourned, having every inducement to take courage and go forward.

Boscawen, June 5, 1841.

JAMES B. ABBOTT, *Secretary*.

BOSTON MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL.

BOSTON, JUNE 16, 1841.

TRANSYLVANIA UNIVERSITY.

ON the first of June, Elisha Bartlett, M.D., of Lowell, Mass., was unanimously elected professor of Theory and Practice of Medicine in the medical department of the University of Transylvania. He was one of many candidates, residents of different States. The chair has heretofore been occupied by an eminent and deservedly celebrated man, Nathan R. Smith, M.D., of Baltimore, who, we regret to hear, is in a low state of health. Dr. Bartlett is an accomplished medical gentleman, who will do honor to the literary and scientific character of N. England, wherever he may be called. He has had experience as a teacher in several schools of medicine at the North, in each of which he exercised a commanding influence. He was the first mayor of Lowell, after its incorporation as a city, and in all his official acts, as a chief magistrate for two or three years, enjoyed the entire respect and confidence of the people. We congratulate the University and the citizens of Lexington on the acquisition of a professor so well fitted by nature and education for the place he is to occupy.

Trial for Surgical Mal-practice.—From the Cortland County (N. Y.), Whig, we have obtained a synopsis of a case of unusual interest to the profession. Drs. Miles Goodyear and Frederick Hyde, two accomplished practitioners, of acknowledged attainments, were prosecuted by a miserable, dissipated fellow for mal-practice in the management of a compound fracture of the leg. After the vexations attending a protracted lawsuit of two years' standing, they have been honorably acquitted. Damages claimed, two thousand dollars. The prominent facts brought out on the trial, are as follows :

"The plaintiff, on the 4th of July, 1839, fell from the stage of a building, in the town of Cortlandville, and broke his leg just above the ankle. The bone was thrust through a thick boot-leg and came in contact with the ground—being what is termed, in surgery, a compound, comminuted fracture. It was set and dressed by Dr. A. B. Shipman. The plaintiff was nearly fifty years of age, and had been for a long time grossly intemperate. The weather at the time was extremely warm. On the 5th of July he was removed to the County Alms-house. The superintendents having previously employed Messrs. Goodyear & Hyde (who were partners) to attend to the sick inmates, the plaintiff became their patient. They placed the limb upon a double inclined plane, confined it with splints, and applied light dressings. He was placed in the care of a nurse by the name of Samuel Baker. He was attended and the limb dressed every day by the defendants, except on one occasion, when Dr. F. T. Maybury, who was then a student in the office of the defendants, dressed it in their stead. The wound was about $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches long, and 2 inches wide. It soon became highly inflamed, and the limb swollen. The weather continued warm, and the flesh, about the wound, sloughed off, and left the bone naked; the end of which was dead, in consequence, as was proved, of the violence of

the blow, at the time of the fracture. The defendants continued their attendance until the 13th of July—the ninth day after the fracture—when they were induced to believe, from the state of the weather, the age and habits of the patient, and apprehensions of fever, that it was a proper case for amputation. The plaintiff was averse to it, and it was not done. The defendants continued, as usual, their daily dressings of the limb, in the effort to save it whole, until the 23d of July; when, at the plaintiff's request, they were relieved from the charge of it. The superintendents permitted the plaintiff to employ any one he chose. He sent for Dr. Shipman, who (deeming that the case required it), on the 23d of July proceeded to saw off about one inch from the end of the bone. He, with others, from that time, continued to attend on the plaintiff.

"It was alleged that the defendants were guilty of mal-practice, in neglecting to dress the limb; and second, in not sawing off the end of the bone, it having lost its vitality."

Death of Dr. Trowbridge, Jr.—The painful intelligence has been received of the sudden death of Dr. Amasa Trowbridge, Jr., of Watertown, Oswego Co., N. Y. Having frequently exchanged letters with Dr. Trowbridge, and known something of the character of his mind, we can sincerely deplore the loss of a man who seemed destined to fill an important place in society. The following particulars are taken from a newspaper published in the town where Dr. T. resided:

"He was on his return on horseback from a professional visit to the upper part of the village, and was overtaken by a pair of horses with a lumber waggon *on the full run*; the pole of the waggon brought up against the Dr.'s horse, throwing both horse and rider to the ground, and crushing the skull of the latter, by the fall, in a most frightful manner. Several persons who were near and witnessed the transaction, hastened to render assistance, but on raising Dr. Trowbridge to a sitting posture, the blood gushed from his eyes, ears, mouth and nose, in great profusion. Several physicians were in immediate attendance, and the skull was bared by Dr. Crowe preparatory to operating; but the frightful manner in which it was crushed told too plainly that no human power could save him. He died in about forty-five minutes from the time of the accident, and, as may be supposed, was insensible from the time it occurred.

"Dr. Trowbridge was the son of Dr. Amasa Trowbridge, professor in the Willoughby Institute, Ohio, formerly of this village, and well known as a skilful, accomplished, and successful surgeon. The son was reared in our midst, and bred a surgeon and physician by his father, under whom he studied and with whom he sometimes practised. He was a bold, skilful, successful operator, and at the time of his death, 27 years and some months old, had attained a high professional reputation. Cut off in the very morning of his usefulness, his death is regarded as a public calamity, and has diffused a general gloom over our village and county.

"The funeral solemnities took place on Thursday last, and brought together a larger concourse of people—among whom we noticed many of our most esteemed citizens from different and remote parts of the county—than was ever before convened on a similar occasion in this village, and the ceremonies of the day were peculiarly solemn and appropriate. During the funeral solemnities the stores and shops in the village were closed, in token of respect for the deceased."

Medical Statistics.—It is understood that Dr. McRuer, of Bangor, Me., who solicited medical statistical information, by an extensively-circulated paper, some months since, with reference to the publication of an elaborate work on the medical statistics of the United States, has not been sufficiently assisted to enable him to complete the undertaking the present year. This is a sad disappointment to him, but will be a far greater one to the medical public. All who have it in their power should furnish him forthwith with bills of mortality for a series of years, and append all such observations as would make his proposed labor more complete or acceptable in this age of scientific investigation. Dr. McRuer's acknowledged qualifications for the proposed labor, together with his many excellences as a man, make it the more important that nothing should be withheld from him that can increase the value of his intended volume of medical statistics.

Medical Inaugurations.—On Wednesday last, the newly-elected medical faculty of the University of New York were inaugurated. The Hon. James Tallmadge, President of the University, presided, and an address was delivered by Dr. G. S. Pattison, in the chapel. The names of the gentlemen were as follows, viz.: Valentine Mott, M.D., Prof. of Surgery; G. S. Pattison, M.D., Prof. of Anatomy; J. Revere, M.D. Prof. of Medicine; M. Paine, M.D., Prof. of Institutes and Materia Medica; S. G. Bedford M.D., Prof. of Obstetrics; and J. S. Draper, M.D., Prof. of Chemistry.

Geneva Medical College.—At the last session of the Legislature of New York, \$15,000 were appropriated for the medical department of Geneva College. This was a praiseworthy act. It would not be at all surprising if that school, from its location, should become one of the most celebrated in the empire State.

Dr. McPhail's Eulogy.—Dr. Leonard McPhail, U. S. A., delivered an eulogium on the life and services of the late President Harrison, before the citizens of Eastport, Me., on the 15th of April, which was received with much approbation, and has since been published. He evinces himself a gentleman of high literary qualifications; and with respect to his medical attainments, were they not of the first character, he could not be an army surgeon. Dr. Moore and the other medical examiners know very well who are qualified for medical commissions.

NOTICE.—A Supplement of 12 pages accompanies this No. of the Journal, which, it will be perceived, is intended to be bound up in the volume.

MARRIED.—April 21, Samuel G. Smith, M.D., of Peru, Ill., to Miss Mary Ann Deland, of Sheffield, Mass.—At Brighton, Mass., Dr. Charles D. Dowse, of Hebron, Conn., to Miss M. A. Baldwin.—At W. Stafford, Conn., Dr. Joshua Blodgett to Miss Charlotte Eaton.—At Roxbury, Mass., Wm. Le Barron, M.D., of Andover, to Miss S. J. Carr.—In Billerica, Mass., Henry Blanchard, M.D., to Miss Sarah C. Farmer.

DIED.—At Southington, Ct., Dr. Timothy Jones, 57, postmaster at that place.

Number of deaths in Boston for the week ending June 12, 29.—Males, 15; Females, 14. Stillborn, 4. Of consumption, 4—lung fever, 3—hooping cough, 1—dropsy, 2—old age, 3—typhus fever, 1—smallpox, 3—casualty, 1—inflammation of the lungs, 1—measles, 1—tumor on the brain, 1—suicide, 1—apoplexy, 1—infantile, 1—tumor in the chest, 1—drowned, 1.

AN ELIGIBLE SITUATION FOR A PHYSICIAN.

A PHYSICIAN located in the western part of Windham County, Vermont, in a community containing about 1600 inhabitants, and having a practice worth more than \$800 a year, wishing to relinquish business, offers his stand for sale. Possession given forthwith. Address editor, &c. Jun 2—3t

TO PHYSICIANS.

AN excellent stand for a physician, commanding a practice of \$1200 or \$1500 per annum, situated in one of the pleasantest villages in New England, about 15 miles from Boston, is offered for sale, the present incumbent being about to retire from the profession. Inquire at this office.

Je 9—3t

BERKSHIRE MEDICAL INSTITUTION.

THE annual course of Lectures will commence the first Thursday, 5th of August, 1841, and continue thirteen weeks. Fee for the whole course of lectures, \$50; fee for those who have attended two courses at any respectable medical school, \$10; graduation fee, \$18; library fee according to the number of books taken. Board, from \$1.50 to \$2.00.

Theory and Practice of Medicine and Obstetrics, by

H. H. CHILDS, D.D.

Principles and Practice of Surgery, by

FRANK H. HAMILTON, M.D.

Anatomy and Physiology, by

JAMES MCCLINTOCK, M.D.

General and Special Pathology, by

ALONZO CLARK, M.D.

Materia Medica and Pharmacy, by

M. A. LEE, M.D.

Chemistry, Botany, and Natural Philosophy, by

CHESTER DEWEY, M.D.

Demonstrator of Anatomy,

C. C. CHAFFEE, M.D.

Pittsfield, Mass., May, 1841.

Je 9—1L

PARKER HALL, Secretary.

DR. J. J. MOORMAN.

RESIDENT PHYSICIAN AT THE WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, VA.

MAY be consulted by persons at a distance, as to the propriety of using the *White Sulphur Water*, in particular diseases, &c. Communications, descriptive of the case, enclosing the ordinary fee of \$5, directed, post-paid, to Dr. M. at the White Sulphur Springs, Va., will be promptly responded to.

October 23d, 1840.

O. 28—1amMcneopO

HOMŒOPATHIC BOOKS AND MEDICINE CHESTS.

OTIS CLAPP, No. 10 School street, Boston, has for sale, Currie's Practice of Homœopathy; Everest on do.; Broncke on do.; Dunsford's Practical Advantages of do.; Dunsford's do. Remedies; Quin's Pharmacopœia; Simpson's do.; Hahnemann's Organon; Jeanne's do. Practice; Jahr's Manual; Hering's do., or Domestic Physician; Rouff's Repertory; Currie's Domestic do.; Broccke's Diseases of the Alimentary Canal, and Constipation, with notes by Dr. Humphrey. Also small works for popular use by Croserio, Eustaphieve, Everest, Green, Herring, Dea Guidi, &c. Medicine Chests for sale as above. O. C. is agent for the Homœopathic Examiner, by A. Gerard Hall, published monthly in New York.

My 12—

THEODORE METCALF, APOTHECARY.

No. 39 Tremont Row, Boston, is sole agent for the sale of Bull's Philadelphia Gold Foil. He has also the largest assortment of mineral teeth to be found in New England. Together with turnkeys, forceps, drills, files, mirrors, platina, and almost every article used by dentists. English and American surgical instruments, in great variety.

☐ Any instrument not in store, obtained to order at three days' notice.

Ap 7—6m

VACCINE VIRUS.

PHYSICIANS in any section of the United States can procure ten quills charged with PURE VACCINE VIRUS, by return mail, on addressing the Editor of the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, enclosing one dollar, *post paid*, without which no letter will be taken from the post office.

June 19

ABDOMINAL SUPPORTERS.

DR. HAYNES's instrument, which is recommended by the profession generally, may now be had at the Medical Journal office. Price, with perineal strap, only \$4—without, \$3.50. By addressing the publisher, No. 184 Washington street, physicians may be readily accommodated.

A. 15

The Supporters may also be obtained of the following agents:—In New Hampshire, Drs. J. A. Dana, N. Hampton; A. Harris, Colebrook; M. Parker, Acworth; J. Crosby, Meredith; D. Crosby, Hanover; L. S. Bartlett, Kingston; L. Bartlett, Haverhill; F. P. Fitch, Amherst; Mr. J. H. Wheeler, Dover; N. Kendall & Co., Nashua. In Vermont, Dr. L. Jewett, St. Johnsbury.

PRIVATE MEDICAL INSTRUCTION.

THE subscribers having been long engaged in private medical instruction, propose to receive pupils, and to devote to them such time and opportunities for study and practice as are necessary for a medical education. Their pupils will be admitted without fee to the lectures on midwifery in the Massachusetts Medical College, to the practice of the Massachusetts Hospital, and have opportunities for the study of practical anatomy under the immediate superintendence of Dr. Otis. Terms may be learned by calling on Dr. Otis, No. 8 Chambers street. Fuel, lights and rooms without charge.

WALTER CHANNING,
GEORGE W. OTIS, JR.

Boston, August 19, 1840.

THE BOSTON MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL is published every Wednesday, by D. CLAPP, JR., at 134 Washington St., corner of Franklin St., to whom all communications must be addressed, post paid. It is also published in Monthly Parts, with a printed cover. There are two volumes each year. J. V. C. SMITH, M.D., Editor. Price \$3.00 a year in advance, \$3.50 after three months, or \$1.00 if not paid within the year. Two copies to the same address, for \$5.00 a year, in advance. Orders from a distance must be accompanied by payment in advance or satisfactory reference. Postage the same as for a newspaper.

SUPPLEMENT TO MEDICAL JOURNAL.

NO. 19—VOL. XXIV.....JUNE 16, 1841.

DR. BOWDITCH'S REJOINDER TO DR. PAINES "REPLY."

To the Editor of the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal.

SIR,—Will you allow the few remarks that follow to have a place in a Supplement to your Journal. I believe that Dr. Paine in his reply to me (Boston Med. and Surg. Journal, Vol. 23, page 183, &c.) has made many rash assertions in regard to Louis, which I think should not pass unnoticed. Still I am unwilling to ask for a place in the body of the Journal, as the subject has already occupied so much space. In the letter from M. Louis to me, it will be seen that he rather misinterpreted the precise object of my questions to him, and probably thought that Dr. P. had attempted to take from himself (M. Louis) the credit of the works under his name. I am not sorry, however, for the mistake, inasmuch as his answers incidentally bearing upon the points at issue between me and Dr. Paine, will be of more weight than if prepared for the special purpose of meeting my wants.

I do not think it necessary to enter into much detail in my rejoinder. The chief items which I stated in my first communication I believe still to be true, and notwithstanding Dr. Paine considers that, "actuated by the lowest motives," I have "thrown suspicions over the honest guardians of the press," and himself in particular, when "*it is apparent that he has had at heart the well being, alone, of his fellow men,*" I still do not retract. Moreover, having been accused of being too severely personal,* it gratifies me to find that one journal in this country sustains me,† and the able editor of the British and Foreign Medical Review,‡ as will be seen in the course of the succeeding pages, is by no means backward in bestowing a stinging rebuke upon Dr. Paine. The "forbearance" of the Medical Press, which Dr. Paine speaks of in his 5th number, is caused, I fear, by the same motives that induced a reviewer in one of the capitals of Great Britain, to say in a private letter to a friend, that he threw the book aside as one which "would carry us back to the dreamy theories" of the past, which "utterly despises the Baconian Philosophy," and finally, which is so diffuse, that one "half of it would never be read, and the other half would not be believed." Perhaps, as I suggested in my preface to the pamphlet of "Remarks," it would have been wiser to have suffered the whole to have fallen stillborn from the press, an acephalous fetus.

"Informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum."—*Æt.* 3.

But I felt called upon to repel so rude an assault, and as Dr. P. has seen fit to reply, I will not yield without at least pointing out some of the puerilities which he has blazoned forth in his "Reply." I say puerilities,

* *Dunglison's Journal.*

† *Baltimore Med. and Surg. Journal.*

‡ *British and Foreign Med. Rev., April, 1841.*

because no wise man would have displayed his own ignorance of the most common peculiarities of Louis's method. But you may rest assured, Mr. Editor, that if Dr. P. hereafter says anything upon this subject, or any other, I shall not trouble you or him with any criticisms upon it.

Mean while, as Dr. Paine has seen fit to honor me with a Latin quotation,* which I presume he thinks peculiarly applicable to myself, it is but right that I should be equally complimentary, and I therefore submit the following, from a writer much more ancient.

Very truly yours, H. I. B.

Πᾶσι ἐπιστάτω ἔργα, καὶ οὐδ' ἐπιστάτω πάντα.—Μαργίτης.

Martin Paine, M.D., A.M.

SIR,—In your "Reply" to some strictures by H. I. B. upon your Commentaries, you say, in application to myself, that you regret to be obliged "to touch upon the morals of another" (183 Journ., 3 Pampl.) ;† whilst previously, without any personal acquaintance with Louis, you saw fit to accuse him of gross acts of injustice to his contemporaries. Your apparent dislike to treat me in the same manner seems to bear somewhat the impress of insincerity. However, whatever regards myself, I shall not notice ; but how have you refuted my assertion that you had done injustice to Louis ? By the following remark. "Shall we, for instance, pronounce the politician a 'liar' or 'a base private character,' because he disregards the public weal to carry out the objects of party, or even advance the aim of selfish ambition ?" "It is exactly in the foregoing respect that I have considered M. Louis—publicly wrong, but probably amiable in private life." Your powers of argument must be more forcible than they are, Sir, before you can persuade me, and (I am disposed to think) many others, that any one guilty of gross public immorality can be an *amiable* citizen. Such a man is tainted with untruth in one act of his life, and the next moment becomes pure as driven snow ! No, Sir, such an anomaly cannot exist, notwithstanding your assertion to the contrary.

You are quite anxious that every "loop-hole of escape" (189 Journal, 5 Pampl.) from utter annihilation may be closed against me. You seem quite certain of destroying my own reputation for justice, at the same time that you undermine my arguments, and therefore you inform us, in glaring capitals, whom you suppose the mysterious letters H. I. B. to indicate. My dear Sir, you take unusual pains to do what, had I not supposed that the readers of the Journal would have smiled at my *bonhomie* for doing, I should have done myself. I had a right to assail you anonymously ; but as I knew I should be severe, I *scorned* to do so. The question then arose whether I should sign my name, and, as I suggest above, I thought that by so doing I should seem to be too much an imitator of other "commentators," i. e. I should put my name to remarks of very trifling importance to the public at large. I decided therefore to use my initials, as these would be sufficient for *yourself* and for any of our friends who should take any interest in our discussion. But as you have seen fit to publish the name, the burden of the folly rests upon yourself.

* Male cuncta ministrat impetum.—Proverb.

† I shall give the pages of the Journal and of Dr. Paine's pamphlet.

You accuse me (188 Journ. 5 Paml.) of condemning my own translation. The unjust character of this assertion will appear plain when I state that you have quoted more than two hundred passages from my translation of Louis's works, and in one instance even preferred mine to Dr. Cowan's. Yet in two instances alone have I referred to slight inaccuracies, from inattention to which, however, you have deduced important results. In one case a semicolon was placed where a comma should have been. You read as far as the semicolon, and then indited a column of "commentaries;" but an accurate reader would have at least perused the paragraph. The other error was equally insignificant. But without further argument upon this point, I stand at issue upon the general idea of any one becoming a "philosophical" commentator upon mere translations. You say, "suppose Muller, for instance, whom I have quoted largely and critically, should start the same objection." Well, Sir, in my opinion he would have as much right to complain of you for using Dr. Baly's translation, as Dr. Carpenter has for your criticism of his doctrines merely upon the knowledge you have gained of *his opinions from a review*! We usually have believed that the best translation rarely conveys to a *ripe scholar* the spirit and truth of the original; but it seems that in the progress of *Philosophical Commentaries*, we may now neglect originals altogether. Can we judge of Homer from Pope? or of the noble tragedies of Sophocles from the dull Francklin? Do we judge of Cicero's philosophical writings from translations? How, then, Sir, can you pretend to be so fond of some of the highest forms of criticism, and yet do not go to the originals of the works you speak of, trusting now to a translation which may have been made by a mere tyro for the sake of a little ephemeral applause, and again to the pages of a general review! It seems to me that upon your own admission your volumes are very faulty in their ground work.

I shall here introduce the following correspondence, which has *some* bearing upon the topics afterwards discussed in your reply.

COPY OF A LETTER TO MONS. LOUIS.

Boston, 28th Dec. 1840.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have sent you some copies of a small pamphlet which I printed lately in reference to a large work published by Dr. Paine, of New York. I hope that you have received them. Dr. Paine has answered me, and now I am desirous of obtaining some replies from you to the following questions.

1. In what relation did you stand to Mr. Chomel during the time that you were engaged in collecting the observations concerning which you speak in your advertisement to the *Treatise on the Typhoid Affection*?
2. Were you the chief physician of those patients whose histories you have there given us?
3. Were the prescriptions made by yourself or M. Chomel?
4. Do you mean to say that you had the sole treatment of the persons whose histories are given in the above work?

5. Did M. Chomel delegate to your charge a certain number of patients in order that you might experiment upon them, and if so, were any among those mentioned as above committed to you?

6. Is it or is it not true that the seven hundred cases mentioned in your advertisement (of diseases differing from the typhoid affection) actually came under your own observation?

7. Was it your intention that these seven hundred cases should form the basis of your work, as much as the one hundred and thirty eight cases of the typhoid affection?

8. What species of analysis did you make of these seven hundred cases?

9. What is the meaning of the word "Recueillir?" that is to say, what do you mean by the expression "J'ai recueilli de 1822 a 1827, &c." page 9, Advertisement?

10. Were there other records than your own of the symptoms, which you could have examined in making your analysis?

11. When you were in the service of M. Chomel were there other records made for the hospital archives? If so, please describe them, and if you made use of them, in what manner did you use them?

12. If you made use of any other records than your own, will you explain to me to what extent you did so?

13. How many apartments were entrusted to the care of M. Chomel, —what were their names, and how many patients were usually under his treatment?

14. Were the apartments St. Joseph and St. Jean confided to you?

If you will have the kindness to answer, as soon as possible, by the address mentioned below, these questions, I shall feel very much gratified, for although I have very little doubt with reference to the true answer to each question, I prefer to be entirely sure.

Accept, my dear Sir, my sentiments of esteem.

H. I. BOWDITCH.

MONS. LOUIS TO DR. BOWDITCH.

Feb. 8, 1841.

I have received, my dear friend, the pamphlet which you published in reference to Dr. Paine's work, and I hope likewise that before this you have received the second edition of my researches upon the typhoid affection. As I have not seen Dr. Paine's work, I can scarce conceive of the importance which you attach to the answers which you desire to the questions that you propose. Nevertheless, I hasten to give them, and send them according to the address which you have mentioned.

1. I stood in regard to him merely in the light of friendship, and I observed in the apartments *St. Jean and St. Joseph* which were entrusted to him. The only advice I had from M. Chomel was, to give more extent to my researches upon Phthisis, to modify a little the order which I had adopted in the arrangement of the objects of interest in the study of the Typhoid Affection. M. Chomel never gave me any further counsel, and it is my work alone,—a work, too, that caused him to abandon his previous views of fever. If Mr. Paine thinks that I was dependent upon

him for any other assistance than the privilege of observing in his apartments, he is wholly deceived. I am under no scientific obligations to M. Chomel; while, on the other hand, my researches at the hospital La Charité may have been very useful to him.

2. I was in no respect the physician of the patients whose histories I collected. I observed the condition of the patients, and nothing more; in the same way that I did at Gibraltar when examining the Yellow Fever. At the latter place I was frequently requested to undertake to treat the patients, and as constantly refused, because I wished to remain entirely in my station of simple observer. It is evident, in fact, that we must have more confidence in the results drawn from patients whom we simply observe, without at the same time treating them, than we should from similar results from patients whom we are observing and treating at the same time. Before my second edition of the work on Fever, I never deduced any inferences on Therapeutics, save from the observations of others, and it is only in this second edition, together with that of my researches upon Blood-letting and Tartarized Antimony, that I have given the results of my practice.

3. Every prescription was made by M. Chomel.

4. No one of the patients whose cases I have given in my researches upon the typhoid affection, were submitted to my treatment.

5. M. Chomel never gave me any patients to treat, and had he wished to do so, I should have refused, for the reasons mentioned above.

6. It is evident from the expressions made use of in the first edition of my researches upon the typhoid affection, that the histories of the patients of which I have given an analysis, were collected by me, and that I saw and studied all those patients.

7. My researches upon the typhoid affection rest, at the same time, upon the 188 cases of this affection which I analyzed, and upon the 700 observations of other acute diseases which I likewise analyzed.

8. The analysis which I made of these last (700) cases, consisted in comparing, by means of the numerical method, the symptoms and lesions found in the individuals affected with the typhoid affection, with the symptoms and lesions found in individuals affected with other acute diseases. This is evident from the perusal of the smallest portion of my work, as well as from its entire contents.

9. When I say "*J'ai recueilli l'histoire*" of a patient, I mean to express that I noted, day by day, in my notes, every circumstance that the patient has presented to my observation. ["*Quand je dis que j'ai recueilli l'histoire d'un malade, je veux exprimer que j'ai consigné, jour par jour, dans mes notes, tout ce que le malade offrait à mon observation.*"] I beg the reader to remember that out of my translation of "*recueillir*" Dr. P. makes a great plot to deceive my medical brethren.]

10, 11, 12. There is no record of symptoms kept in the hospitals in Paris, therefore I could not consult them; but if there had been millions, I should never have had recourse to them, for the reasons mentioned in the advertisement to my researches upon phthisis, my memoir upon the proper method of arriving at general facts, viz. because it is difficult to observe, and because when I began to pursue my researches no one

had such confidence in such records as would have led me to place entire faith in any that might have been kept at that epoch. Nothing but prejudice (*mauvaise foi*), as it seems to me, will deny that my researches have had an influence upon the exact method of observation which prevails now, and that no one before me had pointed out the difficulty of observation—a new proof that, generally, observations were made with very little exactness.

In regard to numerical analysis, I would remark that although some may have made attempts before I tried it, it was by instinct, and in this manner solely; but no one ever made a law of it, whereby to arrive at the knowledge of truth. The numerical method has been used by physicians only since yesterday, as it were; it is a wholly new thing, and all, or nearly all, the works by physicians prove it. M. Chomel has hardly done me complete justice upon this point. Mess. Marc D'Espine, of Geneva, Valleix, and finally Prof. Forget of Strasburg, are the only persons who have attributed to me what really belongs to me. (See the last page of the Treatise of M. Forget upon Enterite Folliculeuse.)

I advise you, my dear friend, in furtherance of the object that you have in view, to read the preface to the second edition of my researches upon the typhoid affection, and that to the Examination of the Review of my works by M. Broussais. You will have no difficulty afterwards, in demonstrating that if any one wishes to prove that I have been guided, he is mistaken, since my results destroyed M. Chomel's work upon Fevers, &c. How could I have been guided by a man who, although certainly of great talent, employed all the force of his mind and of his time in sustaining the doctrine of the essential nature of fevers? He evidently was not following a good method, and like his contemporaries did not seem to be at all aware that the imperfect condition of medicine depended mainly upon incomplete observation, and to a still more imperfect analysis of facts, I had almost said a total absence of all analysis. For what physician before this ever laid down for himself a law never to state a general proposition, unless it was the rigorous expression of the numerical analysis of a greater or less number of facts. If any general proposition has been stated without its being a rigorous expression of facts, I disavow it, and my friends should do the same, and not consider such a proposition except as the effect of a heedless mode of reasoning.

I hope, my dear friend, that this letter will arrive in season. I have with pleasure kept you in remembrance among your good friends at Paris. My wife thanks you for your recollection of her. We are all very well, and hope that you are so likewise. * * * * Do not forget to remember me to Mess. Jackson, Warren, Shattuck, &c., and receive, my dear friend, the renewed expression of my sincere attachment.

(Signed)

LOUIS.

I doubt not, Sir, that you will find enough to carp at in the above letter, and that it will serve, in your opinion, to sustain the idea set forth that Louis runs high over the ruins of others. But at present I wish to use the epistle for a different purpose from any discussion upon this subject.

Now, sir, the pages 189 to 193 Journal, or 7 to 10 Pamphlet, are

occupied in attempting to prove that Louis had the care of the patients, and was responsible for their treatment—and in answer to the whole of these pages I refer to Louis's response to my first four questions. By these answers your whole fabric is overthrown. I will therefore pass over them, with a single remark upon your closing lament at being obliged to use "any language that may be offensive to a chastened taste; but vulgarity may not always be rebuked by forbearance," &c. You perhaps forget that you accuse Louis of condemning to the *guillotine* (your own *Italics*) all his predecessors, most of his contemporaries, and threatening even posterity "with the same fate if it do not believe in him." Have you not said that he "sats himself upon other men's ruins"? that "he knows no road to fame, but over the ruins of others"? and have you not by what doubtless you supposed to be a very apt quotation, applied to him the very polite epithet of *confounded fool*? (your *Italics*.) How sadly you must feel to be obliged by my "vulgarity" towards you, to use language improper for chastened ears! Your remarks are so *polished* in reference to one who never reviled you, that no one for a moment can doubt that it must be very disagreeable to you to feel obliged to speak harshly of one who has rebuked you freely and frankly, but, at the same time, truly.

In your second number you prepare several articles of indictment, which certainly seem very severe; but in some manner they seem to elude my grasp, as I proceed: and several friends have noticed the same peculiarity. The assertions are made, but, contrary to what happens in courts of justice, we have no verdict returned. The articles disappear mainly in *tenuis auras*. In regard to what I stated about the number of cases used by Louis, I refer to my Remarks, as I do not conceive that your answer needs any criticism. But on page 204 J. (or 14 P.) you accuse me of altering my translation for the purpose of injuring you. You will doubtless scarcely believe me, when I say that the *plot* you discover on my part reminds me of the famous political plot which occurred in your city a short time previously to the recent presidential canvass. It existed alone in the brains of the conceivers of it; but, alas! the public could not be made to believe a word of it. The difference between my present and former translation arose in this way. Upon examining the *original* work (according to the rule so very offensive to you) I sought to give as accurate a translation as I could from my knowledge of Louis's usual method of observing. I did so without in the least thinking of my previous translation. My sole aim was to state the truth as clearly as I could. Yet you, sir, dare to say that my "new translation is false," and subsequently you accuse me of wilfully stating what I knew to be untrue, and that I knew my first translation was the more correct. Now I wish the reader to understand that this plot arose from my having translated at first the word "*recueillir*" by the very indefinite, so far as Louis is concerned, but correct in its general signification, word "collect." You, sir, evidently meant to insinuate that Louis had never carefully examined and recorded any but 133 cases; whereby one of the chief elements in the support of the Researches on typhoid would have been destroyed. But I knew he had done more, and therefore I said that he

"carefully recorded" (instead of "collected"), because I knew, from personal intercourse, that that was the signification in his mind of that term. But I refer you to 9th answer of his letter, and in that you will find that I have very exactly translated the whole. Where, now, is my plot, in the exposure of which you use nearly 10 pages of your pamphlet!

Again, in regard to your assertion that I endeavor to mislead my medical brethren about the 700 cases, also to his use of other records, and the foolish assumption that Louis had the wards St. John and St. Joseph committed to his care, I refer you to answers 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10, 11, 12, and 13; and by these I undermine your whole structure of infamy, described between pages 200 and 210 J., (12 and 20 P.) and which you hoped would weigh me down. It falls back upon the builder, and thus I leave this chapter and pass to your 3d article.

From page 216 to 220 J., (or 20 to 24 P.) you endeavor to prove that Louis ought not to be allowed anything which he does not grant to others. You say he should have given the histories of all his patients, so that we might judge of their merits. It seems to me that you require of him rather too much. The record of 58 cases merely of the typhoid disease swells the work upon that disease to twice the size that it would have were no observations given. Now if the 800 "carefully recorded" cases had been printed, we should have had an enormous number of volumes. I am willing to allow, if you wish it, that he ought to have printed them, and yet I would ask you whether any one would have had more faith in him for so doing. I do not mean that you should infer that we ought to have equal confidence in Dr. Perry's 4000 cases, as we have in the manuscript cases of Louis; for Louis has demonstrated in the cases he has detailed, his accuracy of observation and skill in diagnosis. Dr. Perry may be equally accurate, but we may have no proof.

But the most amusing portion of this article is that in which you assert that "you have unravelled the snare, and made out fully your specifications." Truly, as I have already hinted, I cannot see how you have proved all your articles of indictment, even if your own evidence had not been controverted by Louis's letter. I am perhaps somewhat blinded, but I was much struck with the truth of the following remark which I find in the British and Foreign Medical Review, April, 1841. The writer is criticizing your Commentaries, and the remark seems to apply very well to the present case: "But we fancy that his mind must be deficient in one qualification, which is rather important for one who sets up for a philosopher (a title of which we should judge by the heading of four of his essays that the writer is rather ambitious), namely, the capability of perceiving accurately the relation of ideas. This notion we have formed from the multitude of instances of loose and incoherent reasoning, of contradictory statements, and of misinterpretations of the opinions of others, that we have detected in his works." But perhaps this is sufficient for this article.

Article 4. You apply the epithet "*atrocious*" (page 233 J., or 25 P.) to my assertions that you "never let the reader lose sight of the main object of your work, viz. a violent attack upon the Numerical, or, as he chooses to call it, the Anatomical School." In calling Louis the Rival

Anatomist of Andral (Vol. 2, 558); in speaking of one of Louis's cases as one of the strong cases of the Anatomical School (Vol. 2, 631), in quoting Louis's remarks, and adding thereunto "or the Anatomical School" (Vol. 2, 641), I presumed at least that you thought these two schools to be nearly allied, identified in fact, or that the Numerical was swallowed up in the Anatomical. Now, as in my Remarks I proved that Louis, though valuing highly Morbid Anatomy, is continually advising the student to examine carefully the symptoms, I consider that the Numerical School stands upon higher ground than you allow. It endeavors to attend accurately to Physiology, to the Symptoms of Disease, and Morbid Anatomy. I regard Louis as the incarnation, if I may so say, of the Numerical Theory of Medicine, but by the above remarks you make him a mere anatomist. This is what I complain of. The strict follower of the Numerical Method stands far above the Morbid Anatomist. But you too frequently, as we have seen above, use the terms Numerical and Anatomical as equally applicable to the same person. In the technical sense of these words they should not be thus used.

Again, you complain that I state that you never let us "lose sight of the main object," viz. "a violent attack upon the numerical school." Perhaps "a" would have been more appropriate than *the*; nevertheless, I wish to enumerate the reasons why I made the remark, viz.: 1st, because of the long chapter devoted exclusively to the writings of Louis, which are the only *perfect* specimens of the Numerical Method in existence. If the results contained therein are useless, the method, so far as it was pursued in arriving at these results, is useless, so intimately are the two connected. In other words, the Numerical Method is attacked. It is useless for you to deny this, for Louis's writings rest wholly upon this method; it runs through all his works, and any one who attacks one as you have done, must necessarily attack the other. But, 2d, in addition to this chapter, I repeat that you never let us lose sight of your determination to make a violent attack upon Louis and his writings, which, according to these views, is synonymous with opposition to the Numerical Method.

You say, sir, these are misrepresentations, and that they are "atrocious." Let us go a little further. I have spoken of the long chapter devoted to Louis, and the reader will observe that to no one individual have you shown so much *honor*, in this respect, as to him; for to him and his writings alone have you devoted this whole chapter. But we have likewise constant reference to them through both volumes, and as you seem so much startled at this assertion, I have taken the liberty of examining again still more carefully this point, and I find it true, numerically, that in as many as forty different passages, in the two volumes, you allude to, and sometimes abuse most heroically, M. Louis, his works, or his method. Only seven times in this number do you quote him with pleasure, and usually on these occasions it is to help prove a point that you wish to gain. In some of the cases it is true that, like the mouse's head from behind the Acanthus leaf, your spirit of hostility *peeps out* cautiously, or in the form of a sneer. Nevertheless, it is always evident, to a cautious eye. To refresh your memory upon these points, I refer you to

the following pages: 230, 238, 282, 293 to 303 (violent), 305, 314, 331, 408, 533, 626, 681, 696, of Vol. 1; 195, 249, 250, 280, 302, 320, 327, 335, 431, 432, 451, 452, 503, 531, 534, 536, 542, 558, 574, 586, 617, 618, 626, 629, 631-2-3, 641, 645-6-7-8, of Vol. 2.

Now if these do not prove that the main object of your volumes was what I have stated it to be, at least they prove that amid almost all your labors, you scarcely ever forget your dislike of Louis and his Method; and they certainly prove the truth of my assertion, that "there is scarcely a hundred successive pages in either volume in which this opposition does not manifest itself." So much for the first four pages of this article.

On page 236 J., or 26 P., you state that Louis neglects various considerations of climate, constitution, habits, age, sex, &c. Please, sir, read his essay on Clinical Instruction,* wherein you will find much stress laid upon the necessity of studying these very subjects.

On page 239 J., or 31 P., you have another plot, and in answer I would merely refer the reader to my Remarks, pages 13-14, where he will see that the alteration of the follicles, according to Chomel, is "a lesion wholly peculiar to the typhoid affection." But I will waste no time upon this point. I retract not an iota. The only way in which I can account for your assertion, is that from your dislike of every thing like an autopsy, you must be ignorant of the distinctions which have been made in pathological anatomy in modern times. I confidently refer the reader to Chomel's Lectures† in proof of my truth.

In Article 5 we have a renewal of the charge about the generalizations derived from the "debris of the body." It is useless to repeat anything upon this subject, but there is a good remark in the Article above referred to. In criticizing your essay upon the Schools, the writer thus expresses himself: "He seems to forget how much the observation of phenomena during life has been guided by the knowledge derived from post-mortem examinations, and how frequently the value of a particular sign would be lost if it were not connected in the mind of the practitioner with a coincident morbid state ascertained, by post-mortem examination of similar cases, to be probably existing. * * * It is an old observation, that we do not know the value of a blessing until we have lost it; and we would say, in like manner, that we could scarcely tell how much of our knowledge of the phenomena of disease in the living state is really due to post-mortem anatomical researches, unless we were entirely deprived of the assistance we have derived from that source."†

On page 271 J., and 34 P., are remarks from which we must infer that, according to you, not one case of all the patients that enter the numerous hospitals in Paris, is worthy of record; for although you apply the remark to Louis's cases, you use arguments that will apply to all. I have really supposed that it was of some use to visit Paris for Medical Instruction. I have thought that something was to be learned from the Parisian Hospitals. But it appears that I have been in error. "Their (the patients') constitutions are wretched, their treatment worse, and they are full

* Pages 3 and 4, Martin's Translation, 1834. † Lecon's Clinique Med. 1834.

‡ British and Foreign Medical Review, April, 1841, p. 401.

of organic lesions before they enter the Gallic Hospitals." Such bold remarks well become a philosophic spirit! Yet I would ask, have we received no light of science from these same hospitals of Paris? Where have all the great Frenchmen of ancient and modern days been laboring? But their labor profited them not, you say, for they are workers upon a sterile soil! Really, sir, this is a rash, not to say foolish remark. How many do you suppose you will find to agree with you? Doubtless in some respects we must modify our opinions when bringing the results of merely hospital practice to the test of every-day life; but to assert that nothing of importance can be derived from them, seems to me to be, at least, very extraordinary!

On pages 273-4 J., and 36-7 P., you attempt to impale me upon both horns of a dilemma; but I do not feel that you have succeeded, except in proving your own peculiar unskilfulness in drawing inferences.

Mons. Louis, if he insinuates anything, insinuates that diarrhœa can exist without appreciable lesion of structure. But you now say that you meant to state that Louis left the reader in doubt about his meaning. You were peculiarly unfortunate in your use of terms. And on page 275 J., or 37 P., you are so strangely dogmatical, as to assert that because Louis says that in nearly all the cases of typhoid disease the patches were the only part of the canal that was diseased, and consequently the only part in that case to which diarrhœa could be referred, therefore "this looks a good deal like denying that diarrhœa can arise from mere functional disease." How so? If after a certain symptom we find one part alone diseased, we may justly be led to refer the symptom to that part; but it by no means follows that we should deny the existence of functional disease from that fact alone. Is typhoid fever the sole disease that causes diarrhœa; and as we have stated, does not Louis, in the very quotation you have formerly presented, allow of simple functional disease?

I pass now to the part in which the abrupt termination of your publication in the Journal took place. I shall leave the rest of the pamphlet to speak for itself. You in that part accuse me of dealing unjustly by you,—of attacking your reputation as a man and writer. Sir, when I undertook the refutation of your attack upon M. Louis, I knew not who Martyn Paine was. I had not the advantage the English critic had, of seeing your name under the title of Professor, which appears upon the *English* advertisements of your work. I knew you merely as a man who had, I thought, dealt unjustly with my friend and instructor. I freely confess that from the same motives that I would defend the reputation of a father from the attacks of a foe, I endeavored to repel yours upon Louis. You complain of my warmth. Pray, sir, did you not commence the combat by abusive epithets upon another? I quoted specimens of the coarse language with which you attacked a man alike honored and beloved by me, for in addition to being to me an able instructor, he watched over me with parental tenderness while alone and ill in a foreign land. Be assured that nothing but a sense of almost filial duty impelled me to the task which I have undertaken. I am perfectly willing to trust my reputation to posterity, and I believe it will not be less honorable in con-

sequence of these communications with you. I must confess, however, that I do not hope for much good or evil report with the future, notwithstanding my name is to be associated with your own in what you may suppose an unenviable proximity; for I fear that the dust of ages will settle upon us both, unless we do more than either yet has done.

I remain,

HENRY I. BOWDITCH.